arXiv:1604.01901v2 [math-ph] 27 Apr 2016

Recovery of defects from the information at detectors

Anton A. Kutsenko

Department of Mathematics, Aarhus University, DK-8000, Denmark; email: akucenko@gmail.com

Abstract

The discrete wave equation in a multidimensional uniform space with local defects and sources is considered. The characterization of all possible defect configurations corresponding to given amplitudes of waves at the receivers (detectors) is provided.

Keywords: lattice with defects, propagating and localized waves, inverse analysis, cloaking

1. Introduction

The recovery of defects from the available information about amplitudes of waves at the detectors is very important in non-destructive testing in general and appear in areas such as structural geology inversion, medical imaging, and modeling of cloaking devices, see discussion in [1]. The popular methods of solving this problem is based on stochastic inversion. In the current paper we describe analytically the set of all possible defects corresponding to given amplitudes of waves at the detectors.



(a) (b)

Figure 1: (color online) Wave fields in the uniform medium with defects and sources (computed by (17)), where the red defect corresponds to a slow material and the green defect is fast. Inverse problem consists of the recovery of defect properties from the information about amplitudes of waves observed at the detectors (blue points).

The current research is inspired by [2, 3], where the authors considered the problem of recovering smooth compactly supported potential q in the continuous equation of Schrodinger type $U_{tt} - \Delta U + qU = F$ from its far backscattering data. Some interesting observations

devoted to inverse scattering problems on discrete periodic graphs are given in [4], [5]. Note also that for continuous media with sparse distributed point scatters there are stable and efficient methods of recovery of scattering properties (see [6], [7]), especially if the multiple scattering is negligible. In the present paper, we consider the discrete wave equation

$$S_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \frac{\partial^2 U_{\mathbf{n}}}{\partial t^2} - \Delta_{\text{discr}} U_{\mathbf{n}} = F_{\mathbf{n}}, \quad \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \tag{1}$$

(d is the dimension) and try to recover the slownesses $S_{\mathbf{n}}$ from the information about the amplitudes of waves observed at some nearby points $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, see examples in Fig. 1. The discrete Laplacian in (1) is

$$\Delta_{\text{discr}} U_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}' \sim \mathbf{n}} (U_{\mathbf{n}'} - U_{\mathbf{n}}), \tag{2}$$

where $\sim$ means neighboring points (we have $2d$ neighboring points). We assume that the slowness $S_{\mathbf{n}}^2 = s^2$ is uniform at each point of the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ except some defect points $\mathcal{N}$, where

$$S_{\mathbf{n}}^2 = s^2 + s_{\mathbf{n}}^2, \quad \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{3}$$

The term $s_{\mathbf{n}}$ is a so-called defect perturbation of the constant slowness s. We assume also that the sources have the form

$$F_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} e^{-i\omega_j t} \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{F}_j} F_{\mathbf{m}}^j \delta_{\mathbf{mn}}, \tag{4}$$

where δ is the Kronecker delta. The set $\mathcal{F}_j \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ consists of locations of sources of the same frequency ω_j, the constant amplitudes $F_{\mathbf{m}}^j$ are all non-zero. It is natural to assume that all frequencies are different $\omega_i \neq \omega_j$, $i \neq j$. Note that it is possible to have many frequencies at one point since $\mathcal{F}_i \cap \mathcal{F}_j$ can be non-empty for $i \neq j$. The number of defects $N = \#\mathcal{N}$, receivers $R = \#\mathcal{R}$, and different frequencies M are finite numbers. For simplicity, we assume that all ω_j^2 do not belong to the spectrum $[0, 4d]$. As it is shown in [1] the solution of the equation (1) has the form

$$U_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} U_{\mathbf{n}}^j e^{-i\omega_j t}, \quad \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{5}$$

where the constant amplitudes $U_{\mathbf{n}}^j$ can be explicitly expressed as rational functions of defect perturbations (see (15), (17), and details in [1]). We will focus on the inverse problem. Suppose that we record amplitudes at the receivers $\mathcal{R}$. Thus we know the vectors

$$\mathbf{u}_j = (U_{\mathbf{r}_i}^j)_{i=1}^R \quad for \quad j = 1, ..., M, \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{R} = \{\mathbf{r}_i\}_{i=1}^R$. Suppose that we know the approximation location of the defects. For convenience we can assume that the set $\mathcal{N}$ is known, and it is a sufficiently large set which cover all defect points. If some point $\mathbf{n}$ of this large set $\mathcal{N}$ is non-defect point then $s_{\mathbf{n}} = 0$. We assume also that the information about the sources is available. All these data will be

used to determine the unknown defect perturbations $s_{\mathbf{n}}$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}$. Let $\mathbf{k} = (k_i) \in [-\pi, \pi]^d$ and introduce

$$A_j = 2d - (\omega_j s)^2 - 2\sum_{i=1}^{d} \cos k_i, \quad \langle ... \rangle = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int\limits_{[-\pi,\pi]^d} ...d\mathbf{k}, \tag{7}$$

$$\mathbf{a} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\mathbf{n}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}} \\ ... \\ e^{-i\mathbf{n}_N \cdot \mathbf{k}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{a}^j_{\mathbf{m}} = \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{a} e^{i\mathbf{m}\cdot\mathbf{k}}}{A_j} \right\rangle, \quad \mathbf{s} = (s^2_{\mathbf{n}_i})_{i=1}^N, \quad \mathbf{S} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{s}), \tag{8}$$

where $\mathcal{N} = \{\mathbf{n}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and diag(**vector**) denotes a diagonal matrix with components of the **vector** on the main diagonal. Introduce also

$$\mathbf{c} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}} \\ ... \\ e^{-i\mathbf{r}_R \cdot \mathbf{k}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{c}^j_{\mathbf{m}} = \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{c} e^{i\mathbf{m}\cdot\mathbf{k}}}{A_j} \right\rangle, \quad \mathbf{C}_j = \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}^*}{A_j} \right\rangle, \quad \mathbf{A}_j = \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^*}{A_j} \right\rangle, \tag{9}$$

where * denotes Hermitian conjugation. Let us introduce the sets of so-called *admissible* slownesses **s**:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{adm}} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{G}^j_{\mathrm{adm}}, \quad where \quad \mathcal{G}^j_{\mathrm{adm}} = \{\mathbf{s} : \ \det \mathbf{G}_j \neq 0\}, \quad \mathbf{G}_j = \mathbf{I} - \omega_j^2 \mathbf{A}_j \mathbf{S}. \tag{10}$$

For *admissible* defects the direct problem of determining the amplitudes $U_{\mathbf{n}}$ which satisfy (1) has a unique solution. Almost all defects encountered in the nature are *admissible*. Only the structures with very unusual properties can contain *non-admissible* defects. So the considering of *admissible* defects is probably not a significant limitation. The next theorem describes analytically the set of all possible defects **s** which correspond to given amplitudes $\mathbf{u}_j$ of waves measured at the receivers.

Theorem 1.1. *If the amplitudes* $\mathbf{u}_j$, $j = 1, ..., M$ *at the receivers correspond to some defect* **s** *then there are* $\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbb{C}^N$ *such that*

$$\mathbf{C}_j \mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{u}_j - \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{F}_j} \mathbf{c}^j_{\mathbf{m}} F^j_{\mathbf{m}}, \quad j = 1, ..., M \tag{11}$$

and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S} = \cap_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{S}_j$, *where*

$$\mathcal{S}_j = \{\omega_j^{-2}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}_j)/(\mathbf{A}_j \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{A}_j \mathbf{x}_j + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{F}_j} \mathbf{a}^j_{\mathbf{m}} F^j_{\mathbf{m}}) : \ \mathbf{x} \in \ker \mathbf{C}_j\} \tag{12}$$

(ratio / means the component-wise ratio of two vectors). Moreover, for any defect $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{adm}}$ *the amplitudes at the receivers are* $\mathbf{u}_j$, $j = 1, ..., M$.

Remark. The case of zero denominator in (12) needs an additional analysis. Roughly speaking, for the component with zero both numerator and denominator we can take any value, and the manifold $\mathcal{S}_j$ consists of the main (regular) part of the dimension as $\ker\mathbf{C}_j$ (see also 5) below) and linear subspaces corresponding to $0/0$.

Comments on applications. 1) If $\ker\mathbf{C}_j = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ for some j then we can uniquely recover the defect $\mathbf{s}$ from the information about amplitudes of waves. This can happen when the location of defects $\mathcal{N}$ is a moderately sparse set. But for most applications the defect area is large and dense, e.g. it is a square $\mathcal{N} = [a_i, b_i]^d$ with sufficiently large $b_i - a_i$, because we want to cover all possible defects. In this case, the matrices $\mathbf{C}_j$ have non-trivial kernels (see [1]). Also each $\mathcal{S}_j \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is a manifold with dimension $N - \operatorname{rank}\mathbf{C}_j$. Thus if the number of different frequencies is greater than N then we can expect that $\mathcal{S}$ consists of a single point, since the intersection of manifolds is usually a manifold of a smaller dimension. If $\mathcal{S}$ consists of a unique point then the inverse problem is solved uniquely. This is important for practical applications where the goal is a unique solution of inverse problems. In the case where $\mathcal{S}$ consists of more than one point, we can increase the chance of recovering the defect by using some available additional information; for example, if we know that all slownesses of defective points are positive and bounded ($\leqslant B$). Then the set $[0, B]^N \cap \mathcal{S}$ is not large and it can provide useful characteristics of the defect because usually $\mathbf{x}_j \notin \ker\mathbf{C}_j$ and $\mathcal{S}$ consists of complex vectors that are located far from the origin $\mathbf{0}$.



(a) (b)

Figure 2: (color online) Wave fields in the uniform medium without defects (a) and with cloaking defect (b).

2) In this paragraph we assume that the configuration of sources is fixed. We assume also that the location $\mathcal{N}$ of defect is known. Suppose we want to construct the defect that cannot be detected at the receivers. For this we only need to take the unperturbed field $\mathbf{u}_j = \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{F}_j} \mathbf{c}^j_{\mathbf{m}} F^j_{\mathbf{m}}$ in Theorem 1.1 which leads to the sets $\mathcal{S}^0_j$ (12) with $\mathbf{x}_j = 0$. The intersection $\mathcal{S}^0 = \cap_{j=1}^M \mathcal{S}^0_j$ is precisely the set of all possible invisible defects corresponding to given receivers. A defect which is invisible to any locations of external receivers is called a cloaking device. Roughly speaking, we cannot detect this "global" defect from the outside, see Fig. 2. The set of all possible cloaking devices is now the intersection of all of $\mathcal{S}^0$ corresponding to all configurations of receivers (enough to take a finite ring of receivers around the defect). By the same arguments as in the first paragraph, it may happen that for

a large number M of frequencies this set is empty. Nevertheless for monochromatic sources ($M = 1$), the cloaking device can be constructed explicitly together with an arbitrary wave field near the device, see also [1]. In particular, we can assume that the amplitudes of wave field is 0 inside the cloaking device (cloaking insulator). In this case, any object can be hidden inside the region of zero wave amplitudes and is not detectable from the outside. To sum up, taking $\mathbf{u}_j = \mathbf{0}$ and/or $\mathbf{u}_j = \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{F}_j} \mathbf{c}^j_{\mathbf{m}} F^j_{\mathbf{m}}$, and/or any other amplitudes we can construct cloaking devices with various properties. Some additional information about the applications of cloaking devices is provided in [8, 9, 10].

3) Almost all the matrices introduced above consist of the elements of the form

$$a^j_{\mathbf{n}} = \langle A_j^{-1} e^{i\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{k}} \rangle. \tag{13}$$

These components are symmetric in $\mathbf{n}$, i.e. if we change the sign of any entry n_i of $\mathbf{n}$ then $a^j_{\mathbf{n}}$ does not change. They also satisfy the following identity

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}'\sim\mathbf{n}} a^j_{\mathbf{n}'} = (2d - \omega_j^2 s^2) a^j_{\mathbf{n}} + \delta_{\mathbf{n0}}. \tag{14}$$

This equation explains why $\ker\mathbf{C}_j$ (and hence $\mathcal{S}_j$) are non-trivial for dense sets of defects, since $a^j_{\mathbf{n}}$ is completely determined by $a^j_{\mathbf{n}'}$ where $\mathbf{n}'$ are neighboring points. By the same reason it will be more effective to use sparse sets of receivers.

4) We have considered the frequencies ω_j that do not belong to the spectrum $[0, 4d]$ (passband). They can be complex frequencies $\omega_j = \alpha_j - i\beta_j$ (which means that we have a source attenuation factor $e^{-\beta_j t}$), or they can be high real frequencies. At the same time there are many problems where $\omega_j \in [0, 4d]$; for example, the small real frequencies appear in the problems of long wave propagation. For such frequencies A_j^{-1} are not well-definite but we can consider the limit $\omega_j - i\varepsilon$ with $\omega_j \in [0, 4d]$ and $\varepsilon \to +0$. Except for some specific cases of frequencies ($\omega = 0$, $\omega = 4d$) it is not difficult to show that the limit of $a^j_{\mathbf{n}}$ exists and hence we can extend our results to the frequencies from the passband. Such examples are considered in [1], where some computational aspects for $a^j_{\mathbf{n}}$ with $\varepsilon \to +0$ are also discussed.

5) Denote the ratio of two vectors in (12) as $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \ker(\mathbf{C}_j)$. By (23) we have that the element $\mathbf{y}_j$ from $\ker(\mathbf{C}_j)$ satisfying (21) is uniquely defined. In other words if $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}_1) = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathcal{S}_j \cap \mathcal{G}^j_{\text{adm}}$ then $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2$, and hence the mapping $\mathbf{s}$ is a parametrization of the manifold.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Taking Fourier series (see details in [1])

$$u_j = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} U^j_{\mathbf{n}} e^{i\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{k}} \tag{15}$$

we can equivalently rewrite the problem (1) as a set of integral equations

$$A_j u_j - \omega_j^2 \mathbf{a}^* \mathbf{S} \langle \mathbf{a} u_j \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{F}_j} F^j_{\mathbf{m}} e^{i\mathbf{m}\cdot\mathbf{k}}, \quad j = 1, ..., M. \tag{16}$$

If $\mathbf{s}$ is *admissible* then there is a unique solution of (16):

$$u_j = A_j^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathscr{F}_j} F_{\mathbf{m}}^j(\omega_j^2 \mathbf{a}^* \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}_j^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{m}}^j + e^{i\mathbf{m}\cdot\mathbf{k}}). \tag{17}$$

Multiplying (16) by $A_j^{-1}\mathbf{c}$ and taking the integral $\langle ...\rangle$ we obtain

$$\mathbf{u}_j - \omega_j^2 \mathbf{C}_j \mathbf{S}\langle \mathbf{a}u_j\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{F}_j} F_{\mathbf{m}}^j \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{m}}^j \tag{18}$$

which means that there exist $\mathbf{x}_j = \omega_j^2 \mathbf{S}\langle \mathbf{a}u_j\rangle$ satisfying (11). This means also that

$$\mathbf{S}\langle \mathbf{a}u_j\rangle = \omega_j^{-2}(\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{x}_j), \tag{19}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_j \in \ker\mathbf{C}_j$. Multiplying (16) by $A_j^{-1}\mathbf{a}$, taking the integral $\langle ...\rangle$, and substituting (19) into (16) we obtain that

$$\langle \mathbf{a}u_j\rangle = \mathbf{A}_j\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{A}_j\mathbf{x}_j + \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{F}_j} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{m}}^j F_{\mathbf{m}}^j. \tag{20}$$

Equations (19) and (20) mean that $\mathbf{s}$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}$.

Now, suppose that we have some $\mathbf{x}_j$ satisfying (11). We take some $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{G}_{\rm adm}$. Then there are $\mathbf{y}_j \in \ker\mathbf{C}_j$ such that

$$\mathbf{s} = \omega_j^{-2}(\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{x}_j)/(\mathbf{A}_j\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{A}_j\mathbf{x}_j + \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{F}_j} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{m}}^j F_{\mathbf{m}}^j) \tag{21}$$

or (because $\mathbf{S} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{s})$)

$$\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{x}_j = \omega_j^2 \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{A}_j\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{A}_j\mathbf{x}_j + \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{F}_j} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{m}}^j F_{\mathbf{m}}^j) \tag{22}$$

which leads to

$$\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{x}_j = \omega_j^2 \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}_j^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{F}_j} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{m}}^j F_{\mathbf{m}}^j. \tag{23}$$

Note that in the implication (22) $\Rightarrow$ (23) we use the following well known fact: *Let* $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}$ *be two arbitrary square matrices of the same size. If* $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}$ *is invertible then* $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{U}$ *is also invertible and*

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{V})^{-1}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{U})^{-1},$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ *denotes the identity matrix.* Consider (17) (which is the unique solution of (16)) with $\mathbf{S} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{s})$. Multiplying (17) by $\mathbf{c}$, taking the integral $\langle ...\rangle$, and using (23) we obtain that

$$\langle \mathbf{c}u_j\rangle = \mathbf{C}_j(\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{x}_j) + \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{F}_j} \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{m}}^j F_{\mathbf{m}}^j = \mathbf{u}_j, \tag{24}$$

where we also use $\mathbf{y}_j \in \ker\mathbf{C}_j$ and (11). Equation (24) means exactly that given $\mathbf{s}$ corresponds to the amplitudes $\mathbf{u}_j$ at the receivers, see (15) and (6).

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by the RSF project №15-11-30007. I would also like to thank Prof. Daphne J. Gilbert for useful discussions.

References

[1] A. A. Kutsenko, Explicit formula for amplitudes of waves in lattices with defects and sources and its application for defects detection, Eur. J. Mech. A Solids 54 (2015) 209–217.
[2] Rakesh, G. Uhlmann, Uniqueness for the inverse backscattering problem for angularly controlled potentials, Inverse Problems 30 (6) (2014) 065005.
[3] Rakesh, G. Uhlmann, The point source inverse back-scattering problem, Contemp. Math. 644 (2015) 12784.
[4] H. Isozaki, E. Korotyaev, Inverse problems, trace formulae for discrete Schrödinger operators, Ann. Henri Poincaré 13 (4) (2012) 751–788.
[5] K. Ando, Inverse scattering theory for discrete Schrödinger operators on the hexagonal lattice, Ann. Henri Poincaré 14 (2) (2013) 347–383.
[6] A. Chai, M. Moscoso, G. Papanicolaou, Array imaging using intensity-only measurements, Inverse Problems 27 (1) (2011) 015005.
[7] E. J. Candès, T. Strohmer, V. Voroninski, PhaseLift: Exact and Stable Signal Recovery from Magnitude Measurements via Convex Programming, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. LXVI (2012) 1241–1274.
[8] M. Maldovan, Sound and heat revolutions in phononics, Nature 503 (2013) 209–217.
[9] A. N. Norris, A. L. Shuvalov, Elastic cloaking theory, Wave Motion 48 (2011) 525–538.
[10] D. Torrent, J. Dehesa-Sanchez, Acoustic cloaking in two-dimensions: a feasible approach, New J. Phys. 10 (2008) 063015.